The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. XI: No. 4 "Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ." September, 1961

National Education Television To Telecast 'An Age of Kings' in 5 Areas

The fifteen programs into which Shakespeare's eight play Plantagenet-Lancaster cycle has been divided in a series called "An Age of Kings" will be telecast over the fifty-one channels served by the National Educational Television network beginning on October 20. The programs were seen last Spring in the New York City and Washington, D. C. areas. (See SNL XI:2 (April 1961), 9.)

Under terms of the agreement with the British Broadcasting Corporation NET has exclusive rights to televise the programs in the areas it serves. (For plans to show the program elsewhere see story on page 26). The NET network serves 51 stations in 28 states and Puerto Rico, and it is expected that many millions will see the series. Since a huge student audience is expected, educational and introductory material are being prepared by NET for wide distribution.

Pyramid Books of New York City, in cooperation with the network, is preparing for publication a paperback edition of Shakespeare containing synopses and the complete TV version of the eight plays. Oscar James Campbell of Columbia University has written the introduction to the text.

The series was widely hailed on its appearance in England last year. For his production of the series Peter Dews received the highest award for dramatic production from the British Guild of Television Producers.

In the U. S., critics hailed the series as the kind of program necessary to combat the gangland and western programs which were attacked on May 9 by Federal Communication Commission head Newton N. Minow as unsuitable for the steady diet of the nation.

The Humble Oil and Refining Company has been widely praised for underwriting the series for NET. Its associated Standard Oil Company of New Jersey President M. J. Rathbone — sponsors of the N. Y. and D. C. showing — wrote that he "hoped that this Shakespearean series will be interesting and helpful to high school and college students of English literature, drama and history."

4th Colorado Festival

With an average nightly attendance of 776, the 4th Colorado Shakespeare Festival ended its 15 day season on August 19 with a grand total of 11,639 admissions. This was a slight increase over last year's 11,500. Professor J. H. Crouch's production of King Lear was exceptionally well received scoring 4875 admissions. Slightly less popular were Love's Labour's Lost and Henry V, directed by James Sandoe and Howard M. Banks respectively.

George Schaefer with Macbeth Awards

AWARD-WINNING MACBETH TO BE REPEATED

The two-hour color production of Macbeth which won many awards, last Spring will be repeated on October 20th by popular demand. Producer-Director George Schaefer who directed Maurice Evans and Dame Judith Anderson in the film, which was specially prepared for TV, achieved his first Shakespearean fame when he directed the record-breaking G. I. Hamlet starring Maurice Evans. Macbeth is the sixth play of Shakespeare to appear on the Hall of Fame program.

The Macbeth scheduled to open the 11th distinguished season of the Hallmark Playhouse was given six of the coveted Emmy awards by the TV Academy last May 16: 1) Program of the Year, 2) Outstanding Program Achievement in the Field of Drama, 3) to George Schaefer for Outstanding Directorial Achievement, 4) to Judith Anderson for Best Single Performance by an Actress in a Leading Role, 5) to Maurice Evans for Best Single Performance by an Actor in a Leading Role, 6) to Joyce C. Hall, president of Hallmark Cards for his years of sponsorship of high quality TV entertainment. Macbeth was also voted the outstanding dramatic program of the year by TV Guide readers and 400 TV critics and columnists polled by Radio-TV Daily. The Directors' Guild of America voted Mr. Schaefer TV director of the year.

The program will be seen on Friday, Oct. 20, from 8:30 to 10:30 p.m. EDT over the NBC-TV network.

21st Oregon Festival Entertains 99% Of Capacity

With twenty-nine of the forty-two performances playing to Standing-Room Only houses, the 21st annual Oregon Shakespearean Festival at Ashland ran up a grand total of 47,734 for an increase of 4758 over the previous season when 91.7 percent attendance was recorded.

Although one critic objected to Helena's pronouncing her R's like W's, B. Iden Payne's production of MND proved to be the most popular of the plays. Angus Bowmer, Producing Director of the Festival played Quince in the production.

Second most popular was Robert B. Loper's highly praised production of Hamlet with Richard Risso — a rising star performer and director — in the title role. The remarkable uncut production ran for three hours and fifteen minutes with — as is usual at Ashland — no intermission. Charles G. Taylor's All's Well and Richard Risso's I Henry IV ran a close third and fourth. A production of Ben Jonson's Alchemist ran for three nights and attracted 3641 to the 1143-seat open-air theatre.

Though some of the actors are achieving star status, one of the virtues of the Oregon plan is the recruiting of actors from 5000 applicants in what Mr. Bowmer calls "the only 'mail order' company in the country." Some of the entire company of ninety-three are paid, some obtain scholarships, others work for experience.

6th New York City Festival Entertains Record Audiences

After months of uncertainty over finances and then over construction delays, the New York City Shakespeare Festival opened its 6th season on July 5 and entertained about 3000 each night until it closed on September 9. A total attendance of 162,000 was estimated. The stage and amphitheatre were built over the Wollman Memorial Skating Rink in Central Park because a strike of the concrete workers delayed completion of the permanent structure. The amphitheatre sat 2500. Another 500 were accommodated on permanent bleachers surrounding the rink and on the adjacent hillside.

A successful Much Ado — rained out on the first night — was directed by Joseph Papp, producer of the festival. Its mixture of tragedy and mirth mingled with music and dance pleased the audience.

Joel J. Friedman's accent in A Midsummer Night's Dream was on "fun, frolic and horseplay," as Lewis Funke of the New York Times saw it, and made up "in vitality and spirit" what it lost in the poetry.

Richard II directed by Gladys Vaughan had a divided press, but we saw the production on August 31 and were impressed by the remarkable manner in which the director used a large cast of extras to give atmosphere to the play. Court scenes were given lavish attention with dwarfs, magicians, fools, etc. The scenes were almost too busy, but if they were intended to show Richard's profligacy, they were effective. The Duke of York was properly, we thought, upset by his problems rather than the dottering foolishness with which he is sometimes endowed. Unfortunately, the conflict between the Duke and Duchess over their treasonous son earned a laugh where it should not have because of the screaming of the opponents. The play was well worth seeing. The chances for success or failure in these productions are no less or greater than in those which cost more than five dollars a seat. The actors are not highly paid, but they put on a good show.

The season's activities cost $160,000 with NY granting $60,000 and the rest raised from donations and foundations.

Pilgrimages to Birthplace Increase

The Annual Report issued by the Trustees and Guardians of Shakespeare's Birthplace reveals that 225,575 visitors crossed the threshold of Shakespeare's Birthplace during the year ending March 31. This was an increase of 16 000 over-last years figures. Visitors to Ann Hathaway's Cottage increased 10,500 to 177,379.

Of the 101,112 who signed the visitor's book 42,962 were from the United Kingdom, 28,213 from the U. S., 4,464 from Germany, 2,960 from Canada, 2,829 from France, and 2,142 from Australia. About 150 nations are listed. More than $60,000 worth of postcards and publications were sold.

An Age For Kings

Television is being attacked on all sides and it is still a status symbol among many to say, "No, we don't have TV." And it is frequently said with a looking-down-along-the nose sneer as though those who did have TV were ignorant of the art of reading.

Admittedly there is a great deal of tripe on the video waves. Newton N. Minow, head of the Federal Communications Commission, is perfectly right in inveighing against the low aims of most sponsors -- for which they blame their public — and the constant fare of murder, mayhem, mystery, and mavericks. Television must not only serve the nation's wants, it must also serve its needs. The need for intellectual stimulation, for programs aimed at those aware of an older heritage than the lore of the crusading policeman or gun-justice marshal, exists in many and can certainly be stimulated in others.

Ford Maddox Ford's definition of the art of literature as "the highest form of communication between person and person" may easily have its greatest fulfillment on TV with its capabilities of communicating to more millions of persons and more quickly than by any other means.

For drama, a form of literature created especially for visual consumption, TV is an excellent medium within its limitations. It may well be that our view of the constant TV run-of-the-mill play is precisely that held by some of the literate readers of Shakespeare's time to the plays of Shakespeare. Sir Thomas Bodley wanted no common plays recorded in his famous library. Yet there are probably many TV plays that may one day achieve some kind of classic fame.

But my concern here is not with the contemporary but with the classic, and specifically with Shakespeare, who, as Professor Robert B. Heilman of the University of Washington said in the **Yale Review** (See abstract elsewhere in **SNL**), has achieved a status which makes his works widely acceptable as one of the titans of literature: "the a priori acceptance of greatness has the effect of creating openness of mind to a range of experience that otherwise it would be tempting to ignore or reject because of the surface unfamiliarity of the materials." Thousands go to see Shakespeare not because they themselves are critically sensitive to signs of greatness in him, but because his greatness is, so to speak, thrust upon them by the testimony of the centuries and they want once in a while to be in his presence.

I will not say that Maurice Evans and Dame Judith Anderson are not great actors, but in their recent roles in the Hallmark Hall of Fame **Macbeth**, their Emmys were half won before the program was shown because of Shakespeare's pre-eminence among dramatists.

It is for this reason that I addressed myself to the 33,000 members of the National Council of Teachers of English in the October **College English** and the November **English Journal** urging them to exhort the TV stations in their areas — those areas not covered by the exclusive rights of the National Educational Television (NET) network — to show the B.B.C. award-winning series of Shakespeare's histories known as "An Age of Kings." Of the approximately 50 great TV areas in the U.S. about half will be covered by the fifty-one stations affiliated with NET. I have no doubt that **SNL** readers in those areas will make every effort to recommend the fifteen programs — **RII, I and 2 Henry IV, Henry V, I, 2, and 3 Henry VI, and RIII** — to everyone possible. While the remaining 450 odd TV stations are not all eligible to carry "An Age of Kings" because they are within the exclusive NET area, there are nevertheless several great areas — Cleveland and Baltimore for example — and many smaller ones — where the series might well be shown if some kind of pressure were put on the stations. The professional status of **SNL** readers should make a significant impression on stations and sponsors.

I cannot say whether the series will move us farther from the brink of incineration, whether it will do anything to curb jubilant delinquency, or whether it will permanently improve the tastes and intellects of the sponsors and viewers of the mass TV audience, but every age has been an age for Shakespeare's kings — dramatic history proves it. We who believe in it should make every effort to see that the program has the widest possible audience.

L. M.

How American Can We Get With Shakespeare?

I may be inviting censure, but if I were asked to define American Shakespeare I would say merely that it is the acting of Shakespeare's plays by American actors. I am as patriotic as the next man, but not to the extent that I note any great differences between American and British actors. The great literature of the past and present is not British but English and "elevator" and "lift" to the contrary notwithstanding, we speak English too.

I see no reason for developing or fighting about an American style for Shakespeare and I defy anyone to show me any discernible differences except those that are based on the perfectly natural differences, — I almost said idiosyncrasies — of the actors and directors.

Since hardly anybody these days is in favor of strict archaeological Shakespeare, i. e. acting **Julius Caesar** in doublet and hose as might have been the case in his time — and so it was done once experimentally in the Folger Shakespeare Library — we eliminate that from our current requirement. Jack Landau in the August issue of **Theatre Arts** (the symposium on staging Shakespeare will be digested in the November **SNL**), says that he gets violent about the "junk" written about traditional and historical treatment and adds that "it is not the look, the sets and the costumes, but the acting and the words of Shakespeare that make the total effect."

But yet words exist in context and environment. "Expectant" at a race track means one thing and in a maternity ward another. When Jack Landau was interviewed by Herbert Mitgang of **The New York Times** (Drama Section, June 4, pp. 1 and 3) he said, "Why do Shakespeare unless it has a relationship today?" Although he admitted to being horrified because someone suggested doing **Romeo and Juliet** without a balcony scene who has balconies these days? - he praised Orson Welles's anti-dictatorship **Julius Caesar** and follows easily in the same tradition.

I shall not be so foolish as to deny that some of Shakespeare's plays do take on a special significance when done in modern times. **Coriolanus** done in France, in Roman dress, did cause rioting when acted some years ago in a Paris having its own political upheavals. To literate people, the significance was clear and applicable, regardless of the dress.

Here it might be proper to mention that Michael Langham's Canadian Stratford **Coriolanus** this summer was set in late 18th century France when the conflict between patricians and plebians was prominent. The director's comment was that he wanted to contrast the social status, "which it is well nigh impossible to convey if all the characters are dressed in bath towels and sheets." I submit that directors who make such comments are underestimating their audiences. I am not so sure but that designer Tanya Moiseiwitsch is more to blame. She has a long and enviable record as a successful designer and may well be looking for new periods to satisfy her own creativity.

I trust that so far it is clear that I am not attacking changes in the period and costume of the play but merely wondering about the necessity. "Why do Shakespeare . . . ?" Because Shakespeare is classic for all the reasons classics are classics. We ask no one to repaint daVinci, Rembrandt, or Reynolds to make them modern. What made them great then is what makes them great today!

But there is one objection that I must make, and that is to the "American" **Troilus and Cressida** directed by Jack Landau at Stratford, Connecticut. Here, **mirabile dictu**, we have the Trojans as Southern Rebels and the Greeks as Yankees — but yet they talk like the Trojans and Greeks that Shakespeare created. Agamemnon looks like General Grant. Despite the Civil War setting a classic temple adorns the Trojan set although a western style chuck wagon is used for the Grecian camp, with Thersites apparently the cook!

Is this then any longer Shakespeare's play? **Was the argument of our Civil War "a cuckold and a whore"?** Admittedly **T & C** is one of Shakeseare's most difficult plays and most in need of a Prologue. There is no Prologue in the Quartos but someone, perhaps Shakespeare himself, thought to add one later and it does help to explain the scene and theme of the play. Mr. Landau knew immediately that it would destroy the play as he conceived it and omitted it. But by no stretch of the imagination can its omission make the rest of the play credible, nor the Trojan War our Civil War.

There was no great harm in making **As You Like It** "American" with Orlando in overalls and the girls swirling in short dresses eager to show as much of their bodies as possible — but one almost wonders why the director did not set **Macbeth** in 1901 so the audiences could better have equated the murder of Duncan with the assasination of President McKinley!

And that's OUR quarrel.

L. M.

THE SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER
Published at Kent, Ohio
Editor and Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Julia A. Vinci, Editorial Asst.
Department of English
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Kent, Ohio
Six issues annually—Feb., April, May, Sept., Nov., Dec.—Annual Subscription $1.50
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Kent, Ohio
Vol. XI: No. 4 Sept., 1961

The New Shakespeare, General Editor John Dover Wilson. Cymbeline, ed. J. C. Maxwell and John Dover Wilson. Cambridge U. P., 1960, 246p. $3.50; Coriolanus, ed. John Dover Wilson. Cambridge U. P., 1960, pp. 274, $3.75.

Two new volumes in the scholarly Cambridge New Shakespeare series have appeared. **Coriolanus** is the last in the canon for which Dr. Wilson is solely responsible; **Cymbeline** is jointly edited by Mr. J. C. Maxwell and John Dover Wilson. As usual each volume contains a concise introduction and history of the stage productions. In addition the introduction to **Cymbeline** covers the problem of its date and authenticity, Dr. Maxwell finding no grounds for believing that Shakespeare was not the sole author of the play. Both texts are based on the first Folio with all significant departures noted in the comprehensive notes. A valuable glossary identified by act, scene, and line is appended in each case.

G. R. Elton, The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII. Cambridge: Cambridge U. P., 1959, pp. 466, $9.50.

Filling in a gap, this book covers the administrative changes in English government from the royal "house-hold" management of the medieval period to the "bureaucratic national methods characteristic of modern times." Emphasis is laid on the decade from 1530 to 1540 when this transformation was inaugurated under the influence of Thomas Cromwell who emerges as an administrator of foresight. Included in the study are the organs of central government such as the financial machinery and the new courts, seals and secretariats and rise of the secretary of state, the privy council, and the royal household and its retirement from government. Comprehensive notes and index complete the book — a good background for the Elizabethan period and **Henry VIII.**

Robert E. Tenner, KSU

Shakespeare's Musical Comedies

Julian Mates, C. W. Post College

Shakespeare served as midwife to American musical comedy. He began by seeing to it that approximately three hundred of his stage directions are musical in nature and occur in thirty-six of thirty-seven plays. The latter part of the seventeenth century took his hint, and by 1700 music had been added to at least ten of Shakespeare's "operas." From the interpolation of songs, such as "When daisies pied" of **Love's Labour's Lost** tucked neatly into **As You Like It**, with music by Dr. Arne, Shakespeare's improvers went on to giving various characters extra songs to sing, (Portia was among the more ludicrous recipients) and from there to the wholesale operatizing of many of his plays.

But it was eighteenth-century England that really converted the poet to the librettist. Garrick is renowned for having wiped many of Shakespeare's plays free of operatic accretions during the time he ruled London's stage (1742-1776), but even he left the songs and dances which had been inserted into **Macbeth**, kept the elaborate Act I Masquerade and Act V funeral procession in **Romeo and Juliet**, countenanced a **Tempest** of 1756 which contained thirty-two songs and duets, a dirge with Arne's music in **Cymbeline**, a **Midsummer Night's Dream** with thirty-three songs, elaborate processions in **Coriolanus**, and tremendous pageantry for the coronation scene and the christening of Elizabeth in **Henry VIII**.

Nor was Shakespeare excused from being chopped up into musical afterpieces, those short productions which invariably, as the night the day, followed all main attractions on the eighteenth-century's boards. Garrick created **Florizel and Perdita** out of **A Winter's Tale**, and Colman created, again abridged, **A Winter's Tale** out of Garrick's **Florizel and Perdita**, "embellished with several additional songs." The Shakespeare-to-Garrick-to-Colman double play was again executed with **A Midsummer Night's Dream**: it became Garrick's opera **The Fairies** in 1775 (with twenty-seven songs), and Colman abridged the opera to an afterpiece a little later. Garrick also altered **The Taming of the Shrew** to **Katherine and Petruchio**, and a ballad opera, **A Cure for the Spleen**, was based on the same play.

What has all this to do with American musical comedy? Simply this. England, with a variety of dramatic traditions, could absorb the musical drama of the eighteenth century. America, with no dramatic traditions, was exposed to English drama at the height of English "opera" (under which term was included plays with heavy musical stress, as well as ballad operas, pasticcios, and comic operas). The first American theatres were built in the eighteenth century, the first acting companies were English, and the result was that the operatic Shakespeare was the only Shakespeare seen. **The Beggar's Opera**, in 1728, had introduced something new to the English stage, and the rest of the eighteenth century saw an almost incredible proliferation of musical-stage forms. By 1800, English drama had absorbed these forms, but a musical drama had become America's only dramatic tradition — towns with a population of only three thousand enjoyed a regular theatre season, and over half the performances they saw were musical. And Shakespeare, musical Shakespeare, was the mainstay of the repertory.

In America, as in England, Shakespeare's butterflies became caterpillars. The very first play that Lewis Hallam's company performed in Williamsburg (1752) was **The Merchant of Venice**, and special mention was made of the songs in character sung by Lorenzo — Jessica's songs were stressed in other productions. The operatic **Tempest** was one of the most popular musicals: Charleston advertised a "Dance of Demons" in Act II of the play, and Purcell's music in Act III; the elaborate machinery utilized and the masque which followed were inevitably stressed. America was equally adept at Shakespearean perversions, an example of which is **The Tamer Tamed; or A Good Wife at Last** which emerged from **The Taming of the Shrew**.

Even when Shakespeare was not performed as a musical comedy, the plays bore musical encumbrances. A production of **Much Ado About Nothing** in May, 1796, at the John Street Theatre in New York, featured a masquerade and a dance in Act II and a triple hornpipe at the end. A month earlier the same theatre had offered **Macbeth**: twelve vocal parts are listed in the advertisements plus the two principal characters in the witches' dance; Locke's music is mentioned, too.

As the colonies grew, the theatre expanded, moving in all directions, taking with it a musical repertory — America's first theatre tradition. And whenever there was a theatre, Shakespeare was performed: acted, sung, and danced. In eighteenth-century America Mr. Hammerstein would have had to look to his laurels; Shakespeare was the librettist of the day.

The Itinerant Scholar

At the Southeastern Renaissance Conference, Duke University, April 21-22, 1961:

The Tragic Hero of Shakespeare and Aristotle

Raymond Jenkins, Catawba College

The tragic hero of Shakespeare is a far nobler man than the tragic hero of Aristotle's **Poetics**. The hero of Aristotle falls through an error in judgment or some frailty, and he is not pre-eminently good and just. Of the heroes of his tragedies Shakespeare seems to say that their defects and virtues are inseparable. By virtue of Shakespeare's idealization of his heroes, Shakespearean tragedy closely approximates the type of action that Aristotle says a writer should avoid: the spectacle of a good man brought from prosperity to adversity.

In his salient traits the Shakespearean tragic hero far more closely resembles the ideal man of Aristotle's **Ethics** than the ideal tragic hero of his **Poetics**. Aristotle says that the high-minded man is frank and outspoken, open in his hatreds and friendships, always aspires to be superior, prefers what is noble to what is profitable, cares more for truth than reputation or what people say, and cares most for honor. He desires great honors only and does not run into danger for trifling reasons. But he will face danger in a great cause, and in the hour of danger is reckless of his life because he feels that life is not worth living without honor. This Aristotelian concept, doubtless a commonplace to the Elizabethan aristocracy, appears to be in Hamlet's mind in the lines:

> Rightly to be great
> Is not to stir without great argument,
> But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
> When honour's at the stake.

"It is hard," Aristotle concludes, "to be high-minded, for greatness of soul is impossible without moral nobility." In all of these respects Shakespeare's tragic hero resembles Aristotle's high-minded or great-souled man.

Shakespeare tells us in all his plays that the Christian virtues of the Age of Faith — humility and patience, love and the readiness to forgive — are the prime essentials in estimating human greatness. In adversity Shakespeare's tragic heroes exhibit their innate nobility. Shakespeare makes us feel that these men win a spiritual victory despite their earthly defeat. Antony is so transfigured by the deaths of Enobarbus, Eros, and Cleopatra that he becomes a king in the realms of the spirit. Hamlet, we feel, is the nobler man in that he delayed killing the king until Claudius had killed him by treachery. This greatness of soul which enables Shakespeare's heroes to face calamity and death with heroic fortitude is the chief trait of Aristotle's ideal man. It is likewise the quintessential virtue of the Shakespearean tragic hero.

Gerald Eades Bentley

A SHAKESPEARE: BIOGRAPHICAL HANDBOOK

The distinguished Murray Professor of English at Princeton, Gerald Eades Bentley, author of **The Jacobean and Caroline Stage** as well as several other basic works on the period, presents the essential biographical information on Shakespeare as an actor, playwright, and nondramatic poet. Mr. Bentley focuses upon the documents Shakespeare left in Stratford and in London and places them in the context of similar documents of the time, so that their significance becomes apparent. He also discusses controversial facts and fancies surrounding Shakespeare, including the hard-to-kill theories that he never wrote the plays attributed to him. For the general reader and scholar, this is a new presentation of all that is actually known about one of the most revered figures in world literature. $3.00

Frank S. Hook and John Yoklavich, Editors

THE DRAMATIC WORKS OF GEORGE PEELE

EDWARD I AND

THE BATTLE OF ALCAZAR

This second volume of a projected complete Yale Edition of the Life and Works of George Peele includes two important historical documents of the early English theatre. December $10.00

Yale University Press
New Haven and London

YALE

ELMER EDGAR STOLL (1874-1959)

Doris Peterson Franklin, Kent State University

In a volume of the scope of the World's Classics edition of Shakespeare Criticism 1919-35 it was not possible, Anne Bradby wrote, "to represent American criticism . . . [,] but Professor Stoll's work," a piece of which she nevertheless included, "has a necessary place in a survey of English criticism." In 1935 Mr. Stoll had published three monographs: **John Webster** (1905,) **Othello** (1915), and **Hamlet** (1919); three books, **Shakespeare Studies** (1929), **Poets and Playwrights** (1930), and **Art and Artifice in ShakesPeare** (1933); and numerous articles scattered in scholarly journals. Three more books followed — **Shakespeare's Young Lovers** (1937), **Shakespeare and Other Masters** (1940), and **From Shakespeare to Joyce** (1944) — as well as individually published articles and some unpublished. If a British selection of Shakespeare criticism were to be put out today that had room in it for only one American, undoubtedly that space would still be given to Elmer Edgar Stoll.

Mr. Stoll's reputation in this country, considerable though it is, has never been so imposing as in England, where the critic and the scholar are not separate orders of being. Here Louis Kronenberger has found him "wobbly in judgment, and stodgy in outlook" (Nation, Feb. 19, '44), and Mark Schorer says "his esthetic sense is dull" (N. Y. Times, May 7, '44). But in England he was early welcomed into the company of men of letters, as one "in that line . . . of critics, Johnson, Hazlitt, Coleridge, Schlegel], Bradley, Bridges, who are absorbed with the central problem of Shakespeare's interpretation of human character and Shakespeare's dramatic representation of human actions" (Spectator, Oct, 27 '33). Many regard him, wrote Logan Pearsall Smith (**Milton and His Modern Critics**) "as being, next to Sir Edmund Chambers, the greatest living Shakespeare scholar," and Desmond MacCarthy, in G.K. Chesterton's opinion the finest and most fastidious critic in England, thought him "as remarkable for the width and soundness of his learning as W. P. Ker, and for judgment too" (London Times, Oct. 24, '43).

In a brief notice of this kind no adequate idea of the breadth and variety of Mr. Stoll's work can be given — much less of its considerable charm and stylistic beauty, praise that will startle those who have found him "knotty, gnarled, and at times inextricably convolved" (RES, April '45). Yet to associate his name only with the "historical method" in Shakespeare criticism and with the qualities of sanity, restraint, and sound scholarship is unduly to narrow his outlook and limit his fame. It was, of course, as a representative of historical criticism that he first achieved his reputation, and the early article "Anachronism in Shakespeare Criticism" (MP, April '10) laid down the historical principles with which his name is linked: "The function of criticism is not to make the poet in question the contemporary of the reader, but to make the reader for the time being a contemporary of the poet. To criticize is not merely or primarily to analyze one's own impression of a work of art, as the impressionistic critics aver, but to ascertain, if possible, the author's intention, and to gauge and measure the forces and tendencies of his time." To the extent that Mr. Stoll emphasizes the history of dramatic technique and convention and contemporary theatrical practice as these affect Shakespeare, he has seemed to some to diminish the originality and creative splendor of the plays. But to take him so is to ignore that from this beginning he goes on to elucidate the real miracle of Shakespeare's art — that out of mechanical plots and psychologically implausible characters the dramatist could create powerful and moving situations, an illusion of life, and characters that convince and live in the revealing rhythm, structure, and substance of their speech. Those who think of Mr. Stoll's work as exclusively one of correcting old errors and demolishing unsound critical constructs need to be reminded of the words of Emile Legouis, " . . . il y a plaisir a suivre un esprit alerte and sans faux humanisme dans des considerations ou les vues generales foisonnent" (**Revue de la litterature comparee**, '31). "Mais la science de Mr. Stoll," Legouis says further, "sait etre attrayante et le secret de son charme, toujours jeune, est dans la profusion des idees" (**Revue Anglo-Americaine**, April '32).

In esthetic criticism — in the illumination not only of Shakespeare's art but that of other great figures as well — Mr. Stoll's contribution is as important as in historical criticism. Among his students at the University of Minnesota (where, except for three years as instructor at Adelphi College and six as assistant professor at Western Reserve, he spent all his teaching life), the E. E. S. of his initials stood for Esthete Esthete Stoll. The fact that geographically he was a Midwesterner, incidentally, was always a matter of curious chagrin to him. He was born and grew up in Wooster, Ohio, and graduated from Wooster College in 1893; took an A.B. and an A.M. at Harvard in '95 and '96; studied at the University of Berlin in 1902 and then at Munich, where in 1904 he got his Ph.D. But since he lived mainly in the unlocalized universe of art, the geography of his life is not important.

In delicate perception of beauty in all its manifestations and in whole-hearted joy in it, few men can ever have surpassed him. His favorite words from Longinus were, "For the effect of genius is not to pursuade or convince the audience, but rather to transport them out of themselves—the object of poetry is to enthrall." In both his teaching and writing, to show this effect and the means by which it was achieved was his constant aim. His devotion to the work of art was always to it as art, not as a transcript of life, as sociology or history, as the servant of any aims but its own. A cardinal principle of his, and one that needs to be set beside the historical principle, was that laid down by Poe: "Every work of art contains within itself all that is necessary for its comprehension." Shakespeare's plays are not to be regarded as enigmas, as documents in abnormal psychology, or as allegories of his own or any one else's life. They are theatrically effective productions and imaginative wholes to which audience and reader can surrender, and as such they are immediately intelligible, on the level of esthetic perception and feeling. Hence Mr. Stoll's Aristotlelian emphasis on the primacy of plot and action in Shakespeare, his insistence on the absence of psychological realism or logical consistency in the depiction of character. Hence also his lack of interest in the biographical approach. The facts of a great imaginative writer's life have no artistic relevance. To search for Shakespeare's biography through his plays is not only useless but pointless: it is his life that is in them. "In his work we find a personality — diffused, all-embracing, well-nigh invisible — not a person." And he mildly rebukes those who waste their time seeking in the mood and emotional coloring of Shakespeare's plays some reflection of his surroundings or his "soul-state" when he wrote them. "Where the poet was when he wrote **The Tempest**, or for that matter any of his great plays, we shall probably never know; nor need we know. Wherever he was, he was not really there."

These last pregnant words are from the slender volume **Shakespeare's Young Lovers**, too little known, and representing a side of Mr. Stoll too little appreciated. Much of his writing was argumentative and controversial, one of his persistent opinions, as expressed in the Preface to **From Shakespeare to Joyce**, "being that the main hindrance to the understanding and sympathetic appreciation of the great national literary figures . . . is the criticism itself." He once even went so far as to say that if Shakespeare had had no critics he would need none. But because centuries of misinterpretations, like coats of varnish upon an Old Master, encrust a text whose transparency and intensity would without them require no gloss (except for occasional points of technique, rhetoric, and vocabulary no longer familiar), an unfortunate part of the present day critic's task must be to criticize the criticism. In justification of this aspect of his work he quoted Socrates, "For no worse evil can happen to a man than to hate argument." But he did not really relish disputation, for it was his nature to expect complete and nearly instantaneous submission to the truth — in criticism, at least, easy to distinguish from error, as not in the ambiguous world we live in — when that truth had been rationally demonstrated. Frustration and irritation, therefore, though in his writing these qualities were sometimes sublimated into wit and gusto, always made his voice edgy when speaking of critical aberration and folly, and often ruined his style. He approached his critical task, indeed, with a kind of despair. "In most fields of thought," he wrote, "there is progress or something like it . . . Of criticism that can scarcely be said." He was in his old age a sad man, not the less so because of the brash condescension toward his views expressed by certain younger members — adherents to the "new criticism" — of that very English department of which he himself had been for nearly thirty years a principal luminary; and he had come at the end of his life to include his own work in that ironic vision of vain things which the world of scholarship must summon up before the imaginative among those that inhabit it. No, it was not in battle with his peers that he drank delight. "Not here, O Apollo/Are haunts meet for thee." It was at the springs of poesy. And in the best of his writing is to be discerned the man smit with the love of sacred song. In his teaching he was always that man. "I well remember as a boy my delight at coming upon this description of Belphoebe," he remarks in an essay on Spenser: "Upon her eyelids many graces sate,/Under the shadow of her even browes." His students will probably best remember him for their similar delight upon hearing him read lines, some of which had not seemed extraordinary before, in a way that suddenly discovered their wondrous beauty. "The Shakespearean delineation of character owes all its magic to the turn of the line," Shaw said, in words that Mr. Stoll was fond of quoting; and few men, whether in classroom or theater, can ever in speaking the lines have evoked this magic better than Mr. Stoll. "It is a sword of Spain, the icebrook's temper." "The cat, with eyne of burning coal,/Now crouches for the mouse's hole." "Pray you undo this button. Thank you, sir." "I am dying, Egypt, dying . . ." How the accents and cadences of that beautifully modulated voice — in controversy so impatient, nervous, and exasperated, but in reading poetry so mellow and full-throated — return in memory to one whose rich privilege it was often to listen to them. "Still are thy pleasant voices, thy nightingales awake . . ." And there must be many another student for whom, as for me, countless lines will forever sound upon the inner ear not as delivered by whatever stage Othello or Lear or Antony he may have heard, but as intoned by a different, now silenced, but unforgettable voice.

So far as the editor knows, there was no tribute paid to Dr. Stoll on his death; no volume of Festschrift was published. For our Biography in Brief series, Dr. Franklin, student, friend, and literary executor of the great teacher has consented to write this tribute.

SHAKESPEARE ON THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH STAGE: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

Robert C. Steensma, State University of South Dakota

The fate of Shakespeare's plays at the hands of the Restoration and eighteenth century playwrights, directors, and actors has been thoroughly covered in several scholarly studies, notably F. W. Kilbourne's **Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare** (Boston, 1906) Hazelton Spencer's **Shakespeare Improved** (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), George C. Branam's **Eighteenth-Century AdaPtations of Shakespearean Tragedy** (Berkeley, 1956), and Charles B. Hogan's **Shakespeare in the Theatre, 1701-1800** (2 vols.; Oxford, 1952-1957), as well as numerous articles. The following bibliography is an attempt to draw together the more important works in this area, but it does not, however, list the biographies and critical works concerning the leading eighteenth-century actors and directors, for which the student should consult the **Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature** and the standard literary and dramatic histories.

Avery, Emmett L. "The Shakespeare Ladies Club," **S.Q.**, VII:2 (Spring 1956), 153-158.

Bald, R. C. "Shakespeare on the Stage in Restoration Dublin," **PMLA**, LVI (1941), 369-378.

Branam, George C. **Eighteenth Century Adaptations of Shakespearen Tragedy**. Berkeley, 1956.

Burnim, Kalman A. "Eighteenth-Century Theatrical Illustrations in the Light of Contemporary Documents," **TN**, XIV (1960), 45-55.

———. "Garrick as Director of Shakespeare's Plays," **SNL**. IX (1959), 13.

———. "The Significance of Garrick's Letters to Hayman," **SQ**, VIII (1957), 461-492.

———. "Some Notes on Aaron Hill and Stage Scenery," **TN**, XII (1957), 29-33.

Byrne, M. St. Clare. "The Stage Costuming of **Macbeth** in the Eighteenth Century," **Studies in English Theatre History in Memory of Gabrielle Enthoven** (London, 1952), pp. 52-64.

Evans, G. Blakemore. "Garrick's 'The Fairies' (1775): Two Editors," **N&Q** N.S. (1959), 410-411.

Greene, Godfrey. "Notes on an Unpublished Garrick Letter and on Messink," **TN**, VIII (1953), 4-6.

Haywood, Charles. "William Boyce's 'Solemn Dirge' in Garrick's **Romeo and Juliet** Production of 1750," **SQ**, XI (1960), 173-187.

Hogan, Charles B. **Shakespeare in the Theatre, 1701-1800**. 2 vols. Oxford, 1952-1957.

Hook, Lucyle. " Shakespeare Improv'd, or A Case for the Affirmative," **SQ** IV (1953), 289-299.

Kemp, William. "Shakespeare by Garrick," **Plays and Players**, July, 1960, p. 17.

Kilbourne, F. W. **Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare**. Boston, 1906.

———. "Stage Versions of Shakespeare before 1800," **Poet Lore**, XV (1932), 111-122, 116-125.

Lowery, M. R. "Performances of Shakespearean Plays at Covent Garden and Drury Lane Theatres," **SAB**, XVI (1941), 102-103.

Lynch, James J. **Box, Pit, and Gallery: Stage Society in Johnson's London**. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954.

Nettleton, George H., **English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century**, N. Y., 1914.

Nicoll, Allardyce. "Adaptions of Shakespeare and of Other Elizabethan Dramatists," **A History of English Drama** (Cambridge, England, 1955), I, 171-177.

———. "Elizabethan, Restoration and Foreign Models," **A History of English Drama** (Cambridge, England, 1955), II, 66-74, 139-146.

———. "English and Foreign Models," **A History of English Drama** (Cambridge, England, 1955), III 56-73, 110-124.

———. **Dryden as an AdaPter of Shakespeare**. Oxford, 1921.

Odell, G. C. D. **Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving**. 2 vols. New York, 1920.

Pedicord, Harry W. **The Theatrical Public in the Time of Garrick**. New York, 1954.

Pollard, Alfred W. "The Improvers of Shakespeare," **Library**, 3rd Series VII (1916), 265-290.

Rosenberg, Marvin. 'The 'Refinement' of **Othello** in the Eighteenth-Century British Theatre," **SP**, LI (1954), 75-94.

Scouten, A. H. "The Increase in Popularity of Shakespeare's Plays in the Eighteenth Century: **A Caveat for Interpreters of Stage History**." **SQ**, VII (1956), 189-202.

———. "The S.P.C.K. and the Stage," **TN**, XI (1957) 58-62.

———. "Shakespeare's Plays in the Theatrical Repertory when David Garrick Came to London," **University of Texas Studies in English** (Austin, 1944), pp. 257-268.

———. and Hughes, Leo. "A Calendar of Performances of **I Henry IV** and **2 Henry IV** during the First Half of the Eighteenth Century." **JEGP**, XLIII (1944), 23-41.

Spencer, Hazelton. "Improving Shakespeare," **PMLA**, XLI (1926), 727-746.

———. **Shakespeare Improved**. Cambridge, Mass., 1927. See pp. 386-388 for "Works on Adaptations of Single Plays."

Sprague, A. C. **Shakespeare and the Actors**. Cambridge, Mass., 1944.

Stone, George Winchester, Jr. "Shakespeare's **Tempest** at Drury's Lane during Garrick's Management," **SQ**, VII (1956), 1-7.

———. "'The God of his Idolatry," in **Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies**, Wash. D. C., 1948, 115-128.

"Stage Adaptations of Shakespeare," **Cornhill Magazine**, VIII (1863), 48-58.

Summers, Montague (ed.). **Shakespeare Adaptations**. Boston and London, 1922.

Sutherland, J. R. "Shakespeare's Imitators in the Eighteenth Century," **MLR**, XXVIII (1933), 21-36.

Vincke, G. F. "Bearbeitungen und Auffuhrungen Shakespearescher Stucke vom Tode des Dichter bis zum Tode Garricks," **SJ**, IX (1874), 41-54.

———. "Garricks Buhnenbearbeitungen Shakespeares," **SJ**, XIII (1878), 267-273.

———. "Shakespeare auf der englischen Buhne seit Garrick, **SJ**, XVII (1887), 1-23.

Wingate, C. E. L., Shakespeare's Heroines on the Stage, New York, 1895, 2 vols.

———, Shakespeare Heroes on the Stage, N. Y. 1896,

Winter, William, **Shakespeare on the Stage**, New York, 1911 following. Four vols. in the series.

OXFORD BOOKS

OF EXCEPTIONAL INTEREST

The Structure of Allegory in "The Faerie Queene"

By ALBERT C. HAMILTON. In the context of Elizabethan criticism this study of Spenser's *Faerie Queene* outlines the entire poem and gives fresh understanding of its "continued Allegory or darke conceit."

$5.60

Elizabethan Drama
MODERN ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Edited by R. J. KAUFMANN. A stimulating collection of eighteen essays on the poetic dramas of Shakespeare's contemporaries. A Galaxy paper-bound (GB 63). $2.25

Shakespeare
MODERN ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Edited by LEONARD F. DEAN. This collection contains some of the most outstanding critical writing in recent years. Among the 28 distinguished contributors are H. Granville-Barker, Robert B. Heilman, C. L. Barber and Mark Van Doren. A Galaxy paperbound (GB 46). $2.25

At all bookstores

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

New York 16

"A Sea of Troubles"

William E. Miller, Univ. of Pennsylvania

It has long been known that the "sea of troubles" against which Hamlet contemplated taking arms (Hamlet, III. i. 59) had parallels in the Greek locutions kakon .ha'assa and pelagos kakon (both meaning 'sea of evils'), used by Aeschylus in several plays.[1] It has also frequently been observed that Shakespeare himself several times used sea in the sense of 'a large number or quantity.' Examples are "sea of glory" (Henry VIII, III.ii.360), "great sea of joys" (Pericles, V. i. 194 and "sea of care" (The Rape of Lucrece, 1100)[2]. The expression seems to have been almost proverbial, at any rate in the common stock. Robert Greene in Mamillia wrote of "seas of trouble and care," and Thomas Dekker in The Wonder of a Kingdome used a phrase identical with Shakespeare's "sea of troubles."[3]

If sea in a metaphorical sense is common enough, the same cannot be said for "taking arms against a sea." It is not, however, unique. Shakespeare himself wrote in The Tempest:

> The elements,
> Of whom your swords are tempered, may as well
> Wound the loud winds, or with bemocked-at stabs
> Kill the still-closing waters, as diminish
> One dowle that's in my plume . . (III.iii 1-65)

It has been suggested that the sea of the metaphor in Hamlet was literal as well as figurative, and that Shakespeare had in mind the story in Aelian's Registre (1576), book XII, about the Celtic custom in obedience to which warriors rushed into the sea brandishing their weapons.[4] In view of the quotation from The Tempest, this proposal may not be unnecessarily ingenious.

It is the combination of the two phrases that has intrigued attention and has made the line a cliche in the mouth of anyone talking about mixed metaphors. Indeed, the apparent lack of propriety of the combination led in the days of the emendators of Shakespeare to such suggestions for the replacement of "sea" as "siege" (Pope, "th'assay," or "a' say" (Theobald); "assailing" (Hanmer); "assail of" (Warburton); and "the seat" (Bailey).[5] If the two ideas could be found in direct contact in a work which Shakespeare might have read, no doubt the minds of purists might once and for all be put at ease. No such discovery has, I think, been made.

There is, however, one book which Shakespeare may have used in which the ideas are both present, and both in rather striking contexts, namely the translation of Aelian already referred to. In his dedicatory letter to Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster, the translator, Abraham Fleming, praised " . . . amplissimum illud et peruulgatum meritorum tuorum pelagus," 'that vast and well-known sea of your merits.' Fleming was thus using a Latin transliteration of one of the Greek words for sea, in preference to the ordinary Latin word mare, to render in Latin a metaphorical expression which may have been common enough in England at the time the translation was made — and not many years later certainly was. If Shakespeare could read any Latin at all, he should have had no difficulty with this dedicatory letter, which is quite simple.

As more and more of Shakespeare's sources are identified, it is increasingly possible to judge how elements retained by his memory coalesced in the heat of his imagination.[6] I suggest that in a reading of Aelian's Registre Shakespeare's attention was caught by the unusual word Pelagus, used in the metaphorical sense of large number or quantity, and by the story of the Celtic warriors stabbing at the sea, and that the two ideas fused to form his powerful image.

1 Hamlet, ed. Horace Howard Furness, "A New Variorum" (Philadelphia, 1877), I, 207, Cf Malone, Plays, etc., 1821 Vol, VII, pp. 322-3

2 Cf. the list of such examples in Shakespeare's Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, ed. W J Rolfe (New York, 1884), p. 217

3 Mamillia (1583) in The Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene, M. A., ed A B Grosart (1881-86), II, 18; The Wonder of a Kingdome (1636) in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, ed. [J. Pearson] (London, 1873), IV, 230 See The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, ed. Jack Randall Crawford (New Haven, 1917), p. 164

4 [Claudius] Aelianus, A Registre of Hystories trans. Abraham Fleming (1576), sig. li3v, Cf Furness, Hamlet, I, 209

5 See The Tragedy of Hamlet, ed. Edward Dowden (London, 1928), note to III.i. 59

6 Many instances of Shakespeare's association of ideas, and the mechanics of the process, have been studied by the writers on Shakespeare's imagery, especially Caroline Spurgeon, E. A. Armstrong, and W. H. Clemen

THE COMPLETE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE

●

Hardin Craig

A comprehensive collection of the plays, sonnets, and poems of Shakespeare plus a complete and authentic presentation of his life and times. New 1961 copyright includes end-sheet maps of England and London.

1337 pages $9.00 list

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto
Fair Lawn, N. J.

LANDMARKS OF CRITICISM

Edited by Edmund Creeth
University of Michigan

Shakespeare's Homonymic Puns

Helge Kokeritz, Yale University

Shakespeare's Pronunciation, (Yale Univ. Press, New Haven' 1953), with alphabetical list of some 250 homonymic puns and commentary. (Part II of the volume, pages 53-157)

Though it fell quickly into disrepute, punning was a cherished intellectual exercise to the Elizabethans, one not restricted to the drama. It had classical sanction, and innumerable possibilities for verbal play were opened up by the flood of Romance loan words into Middle English, by Latinization of the vocabulary in the Renaissance and by sound-changes at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Homonymic puns, i. e. plays on different words which have come to be pronounced the same or virtually the same, have special value in helping to determine Shakespeare's pronunciation. To uncover them is of course a service to interpretation. But a modern knowledge of Elizabethan phonology must be used as a check, lest we read in plays on words on the basis of the printed text and our own pronunciation.

Shakespeare — as Dr. Johnson observed with disapproval — never tires of verbal play, using it even at most elevated moments: "O World!" Antony laments over Caesar, "thou wast the Forrest to this Hart,/And this indeed, O World, the Hart of thee." It is characteristic of the spirit of the Elizabethans, including the Virgin Queen, that their quibbles are so often bawdy, a fact to be remembered "when dealing with obscure passages in the speeches of Shakespeare's lovely heroines." Ordinarily, one meaning of a punning passage is controlled by what precedes it, the other being brought out by what follows or by some specific indication or idiom in the passage itself. The effect is commonly rounded out by subsidiary puns.

And so from houre to houre, we ripe, and ripe,
And then from houre to houre, we rot, and rot,
And thereby hangs a tale.

Three hundred years of criticism failed to explain why Jacques laughed "sans intermission" at this innocent philosophy of Touchstone (AYLI. II. vii. 26-8). Actually these lines and their context involve a whole series of obscene ambiguities, depending primarily on the fact that hour-whore were pronounced exactly alike. Duped like all other modern readers (but no member of Shakespeare's audience) Furness rejected as containing "sentiments utterly foreign" to Cloten the speech in which he says that gold oft makes Diana's Rangers "yeeld up/Their Deere to'th' Stealer" (Cy. II. iii. 72 ff.). Stealer was pronounced identically with staler, from stale, to urinate. Falstaff puns easily on three pairs of homonyms — horse-whores, steal-stale, and thief-theave (young female sheep) — in IHIV (III.iii. 208 ff.). The obscurity of "Where shal I finde one that can steale well," where one should refer to horse, is cleared up on a lower level of meaning, and we can now pity Falstaff who wishes the charge of foot had been "of horse" and who, "heinously unprovided," yearns for the companionship of a "young thief," i. e young woman, "of two-and-twenty, or thereabouts." This sort of verbal intricacy can be carried to extremes which try even the initiated reader, as when Dromio (CE. III. ii. 80-90) draws on the homonyms claim-cleam, have-heave, horse-whores, abased-a beast-baste-beastly, and throws in an ordinary semantic pun on besides.

"About half of Shakespeare's homonymic puns are readily recognizable because the words themselves still remain homonyms." Of the rest, few have been previously recovered. Those admitted must stand the combined test of phonology and context. Shakespeare took no pains whatever to herald passages of double-entendre for 20th-century readers. His audience was alert to them, and was doubtless assisted by the actors' manner of delivery. But if homonymity with another word can be established from known sound-changes and if the effectiveness and coherence of the passage then appear to be improved by a play on the words, it is safe to assume that the punning was originally intended. Thus, knowing that ME long i and ME oi coalesced, and coming across a rather pointless passage with fine (CE. II.ii. 75), we are justified in noting the neat double-entendre if we substitute foin (fur of polecat). This judicious procedure leads as well to rejection of some puns traditionally recognized. Thus the alleged pun body-beauty (IHIV. I. ii. 28), fathered by White (1861) and unfortunately given a new lease on life in the New Variorum as a relevent case of Elizabethan pronunciation, involves two words which cannot possibly have been pronounced the same.

In turn, Shakespeare's homonymic puns, because to have had point they must have reflected current pronunciation very exactly, can be of great service in fixing the pronunciation of English in his time.

MISTAKES IN TWELFTH NIGHT

Writing on Twelfth Night, Porter Williams, Jr., of North Carolina State College, shows that the mistakes have "an intimate bearing upon the revelation of these themes of love and personal relationships." The generous lovers give their love unsought (Olivia's words, III.i.158), whereas those guilty of self-love make the mistake of mercenary friendship. Shakespeare was skillful in revealing the awakening of spiritual capacities while the characters' reason was perplexed with error. Olivia's marriage to Sebastian, "a farcical mistake of her intellect," contains a spiritual quality in its "most extracting frenzy." The humorous confusion of the Priest is a part of the comedy in the unmasking of what has been fulfilled in error. "Viola, both protagonist and catalyst in the central action of the play, suffers and triumphs through the mistakes of others. . . . Her mask is a physical disguise and not one of the spirit, for she is seen herself always to be 'one heart, one bosom, and one truth' (III.i.160)." Her lines "O time, thou must untangle this, not I,/It is too hard a knot for me t' untie" (II.ii.40-41) shows how the "inner depths of human psychology" are revealed through superficial farce arising from her mistakes (inability to foresee all the consequence of her disguising). In T N "most important of all, there has been revealed a kind of wisdom of the heart that flourishes even while the intellect is perplexed." ["Mistakes in Twelfth Night and Their Resolution: A study in Some Relationships of Plot and Theme," PMLA, LXXVI:3 (June 1961), 193-199.]

A DRAMATIC EPILOGUE FOR THE SHREW?

It is the contention of Richard Hosley of the University of Missouri that The Taming of the Shrew did not originally have a dramatic epilogue, that the folio text is complete as we have it — this view being counter to that of a number of critics, led by Sir Walter Greg, who believe that Shakespeare would have supplied a conclusion to his rather elaborate induction involving Christopher Sly but that for some reason it failed to get printed. To support his thesis, Professor Hosley relies upon two propositions which emerge from his study of the induction tradition: "The first is that it was not unusual for an Elizabethan play with an induction to lack a dramatic epilogue; in fact 26 out of 45 of the plays studied are not concluded with a dramatic epilogue. The second proposition is that limitations of personnel in an Elizabethan theatrical company make it usual for the actors of an induction to double in roles of the play proper . . .; and, further, that since most of the principal characters are usually on stage in the last scene of an Elizabethan play, it was frequently inconvenient (though never perhaps impossible) to stage a dramatic epilogue because of the awkwardness of requiring some of the actors to revert to their roles of the induction without an intervening scene to 'cover' a pause for the necessary exit, change of costume, and re-entrance. In any case a dramatic epilogue, being of its very nature anti-climactic, would have tended to spoil the effect of the play proper." An examination of a number of the 45 plays (they are listed in an appendix) reveals that the use of a dramatic epilogue was more or less in desuetude after 1600 and that doubling parts of the induction with parts of the play proper was dramaturgically and aesthetically desirable. Thus, the author suggests, The Taming of the Shrew was designed and originally produced without a dramatic epilogue. ["Was There a 'Dramatic Epilogue' to The Taming of the Shrew?" Studies in English Literature, 1:2 (Spring 1961), 17-34]

AN AGE OF KINGS

SEE IT! READ IT!

Just Published! A Single Volume containing the entire 15 parts of Shakespeare's famous historical plays just as they appear on television. 556 memorable pages including a synopsis of each exciting play.

Introduction by Professor Oscar J. Campbell of Columbia University.

Only 75c. Special discounts for orders of 100 or more.

PYRAMID BOOKS
444 Madison Avenue,
New York City 22

SHAKESPEARE'S HISTORY PLAYS ON TELEVISION

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION PRESENTS AN AGE OF KINGS PRODUCED BY THE BBC

The 1961-62 television season will see the broadcasts of this monumental cycle on the more than fifty stations affiliated with National Educational Television. Teachers and students will have unprecedented opportunities for the systematic study of the double-tetralogy, including RICHARD II, HENRY IV, Parts 1 and 2, HENRY V, HENRY VI, Parts 1, 2, and 3, and RICHARD III.
The cycle is presented on television in fifteen parts, as follows:

1. THE HOLLOW CROWN — Richard II, Acts 1, 2 & 3
2. THE DEPOSING OF A KING — Richard II, Acts 3, 4 & 5
3. REBELLION FROM THE NORTH — Henry IV, Pt. I, Acts 1 & 2
4. THE ROAD TO SHREWSBURY — Henry IV, Pt. I, Acts 3, 4 & 5
5. THE NEW CONSPIRACY — Henry IV, Pt. II, Acts 1 & 2
6. UNEASY LIES THE HEAD — Henry IV, Pt. II, Acts 3, 4 & 5
7. SIGNS OF WAR — Henry V, Acts 1, 2 & 3
8. THE BAND OF BROTHERS — Henry V, Acts 4 & 5
9. THE RED ROSE & THE WHITE — Henry VI, Pt. I
10. THE FALL OF A PROTECTOR — Henry VI, Pt. II, Acts 1, 2 & 3
11. THE RABBLE FROM KENT — Henry VI, Pt. II, Acts 3, 4 & 5
12. THE MORNING'S WAR — Henry VI, Pt. III, Acts 1, 2 & 3
13. THE SUN IN SPLENDOUR — Henry VI, Pt. III, Acts 4 & 5
14. THE DANGEROUS BROTHER — Richard III, Acts 1, 2 & 3
15. THE BOAR HUNT — Richard III, Acts 3, 4 & 5

AN AGE OF KINGS STUDY GUIDE by Albert Weiner, may be obtained by sending 75 cents to National Education Television, 10 Columbus Circle, New York 19, N. Y., or to any of the affiliated stations listed below.

AN AGE OF KINGS is part of the NET FESTIVAL OF THE ARTS, presented everywhere on FRIDAY EVENINGS. (Consult your local ETV station, newspaper or ETV Guide, for broadcast times and possible additional daytime showings)

Starting October 20

WGBH-TV Boston
WTTW-Chicago
KQED-San Francisco
KUHT-Houston
WQED-Pittsburgh
WYES-TV New Orleans
WENH-TV Durham, NH
WCBB-TV Augusta
KVIE-Sacramento*
*Starts Oct. 27

Starting November 10

WHA-TV Madison
WAIQ-Andalusia
WBIQ-Birmingham
WCIQ-Munford
WMSB-E. Lansing
WOSU-TV Columbus
KETC-St. Louis
WHYY-TV Philadelphia
KERA-TV Dallas

Starting December 1

WKNO-TV Memphis
WILL-TV Urbana
KRMA-Denver
KUON-TV Lincoln
WUNC-TV Chapel Hill
KUAT-Tucson
KAET-Pheonix

Starting December 22

KETA-Okla. City
KOED-TV Tulsa
WTVS-Detroit
WCET-Cincinnati
WMUB-TV Oxford
KCTS-TV Seattle
WETA-Washington DC

Starting January 12

WMVS-TV Milwaukee
WETV-Atlanta
WTHS-TV Miami
KUED-Salt Lake City
WGTV-Athens
WNED-TV Buffalo
KPEC-Tacoma

Starting February 2

WJCT-Jacksonville
WUFT-Gainesville
WEDU-Tampa
KOAC-Corvallis
KNME-TV Albuquerque
KDPS-Des Moines
WFSU-Tallahassee
KOAP-Portland

Starting March 2

WGTE-Toledo
WFPK-Louisville
KWCS-Ogden
WXGA-Waycross
WHRO-Norfolk
WSIU-Carbondale

REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

Editors: Barbara Alden; Laurence A. Cummings, Yankton College; William C. McAvoy, St. Louis University; Marvin Spevack, City College (N.Y.); Joseph H. Summerell, N. Y. State University, Plattsburg; Unico Jack Violi, Fairleigh Dickinson College.
Margaret L. Wiley, Arlington S. C., and Ned B. Allen, U. of Delaware, Editors

BARDOLATRY

After a rapid survey of the high points of Shakespeare criticism — the "remarkably eclectic praise" of Ben Jonson, the doubts of Dryden, the "rigid rationalism" of Rymer, the "crusty independence" of Samuel Johnson, the outright reverence of the Romantics and Victorians — designed to help us understand our own bardolatry (the word is George Bernard Shaw's) Professor Robert B. Heilman, of the University of Washington states that bardolatry is "the kind of faith that on the whole serves good ends rather than questionable ones." Its "pragmatic usefulness" is apparent in education and in the formal practice of criticism. Since the real problem of education is provincialism of mind, the authority implied by idolatry helps break down limitations: "the a priori acceptance of greatness has the effect of creating openness of mind to a range of experience that otherwise it would be tempting to ignore or reject because of the surface unfamiliarity of the materials." It helps us to overcome the danger of mistaking the literary convention of realism for the ultimate and only way of defining reality. With Shakespeare, and the authority of his name we must see reality in terms of phenomena which may no longer exist — e.g., political systems, character types, fantastic beings and events, etc. — but which are carriers of values, keys to perennial problems and meaningful interpretations of existence. The very struggle to know Shakespeare must help to de-provincialize and thus to educate. Similarly, formal criticism has a different role: it is no longer merely defense and attack; its mission is to understand that which has endured. "Its concern is the anatomy of excellence," which task it accomplishes by relating the work to its own times, to our own times, and to all times. Bardolatry, then, "is perhaps a kind of built-in safety device in a disbelieving era." An agent of faith, "bardolatry spurs understanding, and justifies bardolatry." ["Bardolatry." **Yale Review**, L:2 (Winter 1961), 257-270.]

L. C. Knights, An Approach to "Hamlet", Stanford, California: Stanford U. P., 1961, pp. 91, $2.75.

As always interest in Shakespeare's Hamlet is as perennial as what's wrong with the weather. But according to Dr. Knights, what's wrong with Hamlet is his "failure in being," his inability to adjust to his situation without inducing a feeling of corruption that almost paralyzes him. This is the theme of Dr. Knights' most recent thin volume which is substantially a printed version of his four lectures delivered at the Birmingham University Summer School in 1959.

A GUIDE TO SHAKESPEAREAN TRAGEDY

by David S. Berkeley

This supplementary text consists of a prefatory essay on the uses and abuses of Shakespearean scholarship, short annotated bibliographies, quotations from critics to be evaluated by students, and more than 3400 organized questions on **Romeo and Juliet, Julius Caesar, Hamlet, Macbeth, King Lear, Othello, Antony and Cleopatra**, and general matters of technique and aesthetics. Many questions relate to points made in recent Shakespearean criticism and scholarship. $2.50

Key to the questions. $2.50
Restricted to teachers
Prepaid Orders Only

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY BOOKSTORE
Stillwater, Oklahoma

"WHAT YOU WILL"

S. Nagarajan, Mahakoshal Mahavidyalaya, Jabalpur, India, has a Thomist suggestion for the interpretation of the actual final cause of **Twelfth Night**. The sub-title of the play has often been interpreted as Shakespeare's liberal and lighthearted invitation to the audience to choose the title they please. The author here identifies the theme of the play as unrequited love (cf. **AW, T&C, & MM.**), with the unrequital linked with self-deception in the lover: "What they [Orsino, Olivia, Malvolio] will is quite different from what they are, namely their rationality; they do think they are not what they are. Even with regard to Viola, the comedy consists in the contrast between the intention of her disguise, what she wills, and the actual consequence." The action of the play should be seen against the background tension of appetite and will, two words frequently echoed in the play. It is against reason to be burdensome to others. "While well-ordered self-love is right and natural, pride in the sense of an inordinate desire of one's own private excellence is a special sin." Such requital as seen in **TN** has also great tragic potentialities. ["What You Will: A Suggestion," **S.Q.** X:1 (Winter 1959), 61-67.]

SOLID FLESH AGAIN

Sidney Warhaft of the University of Manitoba believes that the treatment of the Hamlet crux " solid flesh" (I.ii. 129) has been inconclusive because critics have consistently ignored certain fundamental semasiological considerations. In 1600 the whole vexed passage had connotations now lost. Bowers' reading of sullied (Q1 and Q2) variant of sallied (likewise defended by J. Dover Wilson), he does not endorse, but he shows that his interpretations would not be in any way discounted if the reading should be insisted upon. Warhaft's contention emphasizes the fact that Hamlet, from the beginning of the play, is suffering from melancholy. Furthermore, he contends, Hamlet is specifically referring to this condition in referring to his "solid flesh." This fact has not heretofore been recognized, Warhaft says, but hastens to admit that his argument is not necessarily conclusive. The Elizabethan malady [Hamlet's "weakness" and "melancholy" (II.ii.629)] was described in Renaissance writings as attended by solidity of flesh — a state in which the blood contained a surfeit of earth, the lowest of the four elements. Hence, melancholy was recognized as cold and dry. Furthermore, excess sadness was thought of as "congealing" the blood, (**Shrew**, Ind. ii. 134). Hence, it is understandable that Hamlet would wish that this solid flesh would "melt,/Thaw, and resolve itself into a dew" — Hamlet desiring to return to his normal state of felicity — a balance of the humours or elements — in which water and air (dew) are normal, balanced. But Hamlet, desiring more than the physical cure, turns to the moral and spiritual. The succeeding lines are ambiguous. Does he contemplate suicide? If so, the analogy holds, for he would then be desirous of fire and air (annihilation upwards into the spirit) instead of "dew" though not so quintessentially as Cleopatra: "I am fire and air. My other elements/I give to baser life" (V.ii. 292-293). ["Hamlet's solid Flesh Resolved," **ELH**, XXVIII:1 (March 1961), 22:30.]

WHICH SHYLOCK?

Shylock is a complex, developing character — such is the conclusion of John Hazel Smith of Wayne State U. after close analysis of the organization, personnel, and acting of Shakespeare's company, the Stationers' Register, and early editions of the play and its sources. Critics have seen Shylock in one of three modes: (1) a grotesque and comic villain, (2) a mere villain, and (3) a tragic figure; an abused human being. Actors' gestures, costumes, pauses, and inflections have reflected these attitudes toward Shylock. In Act I Shylock is villain and comic, in II and III villain, in IV, villain and savage monster. Smith contends that the major plot is the Bassanio-Portia romantic plot and that "Like **Julius Caesar**, the play is named, not for protagonists, but for the man whose safety affects the protagonists' fate." The title page of Q (1600) reads: "the extreme cruelties of Shylocke the Jewe towards the sayd Merchant, in cutting a just pound of his flesh." This identification suggests that the audiences were accustomed to seeing Shylock as a villain on the stage. By assigning the roles traditionally to the eight men for whom the great parts were built, Smith finds that the role of Shylock falls to Thomas Pope. The differences between Shylock of III.iii and IV, and Shylock of the first part of the play are accounted for by the evolution of a character under the "impetus" of the events which take place in the course of the drama itself. This developing complex character reveals the skill (not the carelessness) of the dramatist. ["Shylock: 'Devil incarnation' or 'Poor Man . . . wrong'd'?" **JEGP**. LX:1 (January 1961), 1-21.]